

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ORANGEBURG DIVISION

Kimberly Shreve	)	
a/k/a Kimberly Ann Shreve,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civil Action No. 5:19-855-TMC
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Officer Limpet, Officer Howell, Officer	)	
Wolfe, Officer Lockhart, Officer	)	
Davidson, and Officer Meyers,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

Plaintiff Kimberly Shreve a/k/a Kimberly Ann Shreve, proceeding pro se, filed this action alleging claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Before the court is the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation ("Report"), recommending that this action be transferred to the Eastern District of North Carolina. (ECF No. 8). Plaintiff was advised of her right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 8 at 4). However, Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report, and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to

accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

In her Complaint, Plaintiff, who resides in North Carolina, is raising claims regarding her arrests by Raleigh police officers and her subsequent incarcerations in Wake County, North Carolina. (ECF No. 1 at 2-3). Accordingly, after a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the magistrate judge’s Report (ECF No. 8) and incorporates it herein. Therefore, the court transfers this action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina. As the magistrate judge noted in her Report, *id.* at 3, this action has not undergone initial review.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

April 12, 2019  
Anderson, South Carolina

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.